

## **REMARKS**

Applicant acknowledges receipt of the Office Action dated December 13, 2011 wherein the Examiner 1) rejected claim 19 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite; 2) rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Daniel (US 6,419,147); 3) rejected claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniel; 4) allowed claims 18 and 20; and 5) held that claim 19 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In response Applicant amends the claims and submits the following response

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for being indefinite. In particular the Examiner cited that “the first insert” lacked proper antecedent basis and that line 3 was missing the word “coupled.” Claim 19 has been amended to address the Examiner’s rejection and is now in condition for allowance.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103**

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Daniel and claims 6-7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniel. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Daniel describes a threaded connection that includes a bonding material. After the threads are connected, heat is applied to melt the bonding material to form an amorphous diffusion bond between the two connected components. Daniel teaches using this type of connection with expandable tubulars.

Claim 1 has been amended to include that the insert comprises an inner core comprised of a first material, and an outer layer comprised of a second material, and wherein the first material has a higher melting point than the second material. Daniel does not disclose the use of an insert having an inner core and an outer layer or that the inner core has a higher melting point than the outer layer. Because Daniel does not disclose an insert having an inner core and an outer layer, it does not disclose each of the elements of amended claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 USC 102(a). Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are also not anticipated or

Appl. No. 10/597,132  
Amendment dated March 2, 2012  
Reply to Office Action of December 13, 2011

rendered obvious by Daniel. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7.

### **New Claims**

Claims 21-24 depend from claim 1 and have been added to further claim the present invention.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes all matters in the Office Action dated December 13, 2011 have been addressed. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to USPTO Deposit Account Number 50-5247 (P103-0031-US).

Respectfully submitted,

/Derek V. Forinash, Reg. No.47,231/  
Derek V. Forinash  
Reg. No. 47,231  
Edmonds & Nolte, PC  
10411 Westheimer Rd., Suite 201  
Houston, Texas 77042  
Office: 281-480-2700 x118  
Fax: 281-480-2701  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT